UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/974,912	10/12/2001	Yi-Ming Liao	2769-113	8962

6449	7590	11/22/2005

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
STERRETT, JONATHAN G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/974,912	LIAO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jonathan G. Sterrett	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 October 2001*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Summary

1.   **Claims 1-12** are pending in the application.

Specification

2.   The use of the trademarks **Microsoft Internet Explorer™** and **Netscape**

Navigator™ has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized

wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the

proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to

prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as

trademarks.

Claim Objections

3.   **Claims 5, 6, 8 and 9** are objected to because of the following

informalities: the word '**step**' is misspelled as '**sep**'. Appropriate correction is

required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   **Claims 1-12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over **Hancock US 6,088,722.**

Regarding **Claim 1**, Hancock teaches:

(1) generating a set of shipment information at each stage of

shipment preparation;

Column 4 line 15-20, the logistics node receives information from other

nodes related to shipments.

column 12 line 1-8, the logistics node conveys instructions (i.e. stages of

shipment preparation) to one or more carriers.

(2) downloading the shipment information into a shipment

information database;

Column 12 line 20-22, the shipment information is downloaded into a

database (i.e. a shipment information database) see also Figure 3#308 and

column 10 line 38-45.

(3) linking the shipment information database to a network server

linked to a net-work system to allow the freight forwarder to gain access to

the shipment information via the network system

column 5 line 27-34, the customs broker (i.e. freight forwarder) has a node

that allows them to access the system. see also column 8 line 7-10 for a

description of the database containing the shipment information.

column 6 line 63-67, various nodes connect to the system through workstations. See also Figure 1 #116, the freight forwarder can access the system to gain information to the shipment information.

column 5 line 54-58, various links (i.e. network protocols) are used to connect the nodes.

and through a browser program and access the shipment information to obtain clearance in the case of customs/exportation .

column 6 line 11-15, network enabling code (html, i.e. through a browser program) is used to access the nodes.

column 5 line 39-40, the internet is used to connect the nodes together.

column 5 line 28-31, the customs broker house (i.e. freight forwarder) accesses the network (i.e. has a node on the system) for the purpose of obtaining clearance with the necessary government authorities-see also figure 1 #116 customs house (i.e. freight forwarder) to #190 government(s).

Hancock does not teach printing the shipment information into a set of customs/exportation application documents.

and through a browser program and print the shipment information into a set of customs/exportation application documents.

However, Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art of the internet, to print documents from a browser. Printing documents from a

browser window is a standard, easy way to obtain a printed copy of information

on the screen.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify the teachings of Hancock, regarding providing access to

shipping information from a freight forward node for the purposes of obtaining

export clearance, to include the step of printing the customs/exportation

documents, because it would provide a way to obtain a printed copy of the

customs/exportation information from the browser window.

Regarding **Claim 2**, Hancock teaches:

wherein in said step (1), the shipment information includes EDI855-

related information delivery-related information and ED1856-related

information.

Column 5 line 43-47, shipment nodes are connected (i.e. the shipment

information moves between theses nodes) via EDI, which includes EDI-855 and

–856 information since these are standard protocol information used to

communicate via EDI. –see also column 9 line 10-12 (confirmation for orders

received, i.e. EDI855 related information) and column 9 line 20 (shipment

manifest generated, i.e. EDI856 related information).

Regarding **Claim 3**, Hancock teaches:

wherein in said step (3), the network system is Internet.

Column 5 line 40, various nodes can be networked together using the internet.

Regarding **Claim 4**, Hancock teaches using the internet for the operating network and using HTML as a communication protocol (i.e. a web browser). H

Hancock does not teach:

wherein in said step (3), the network server is a Web server.

Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art of the internet to use a web server as a network server. Web servers provide the ability to serve web pages to computers that are connected to the internet. Using webservers to serve webpages minimizes the computing capability necessary for remote computers to access and display internet content.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Hancock, regarding utilizing the internet as the network to convey shipping information, to include the step of where the network server is a web server, because it would reduce the amount of computing power required by remote computers to access the web server to display web pages.

Regarding **Claim 5**, Hancock teaches the use of the internet and html as elements of a computer network but does not teach:

wherein in said step (3), the browser program is Microsoft Internet Explorer™.

Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art of the internet for the browser program to be Microsoft Internet Explorer™. This program is widely used in PC's for the purpose of accessing content on the internet and provides an easy to use interface for internet access.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Hancock, regarding utilizing the internet as the network to convey shipping information, to include the step of where the browser program is Microsoft Internet Explorer™, because it would provide an easy-to-use way to access the internet.

Regarding **Claim 6**, Hancock teaches the use of the internet and html as elements of a computer network but does not teach:

wherein in said step (3), the browser program is Netscape Navigator™

Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art of the internet for the browser program to be Netscape Navigator™. This program is widely used in PC's for the purpose of accessing content on the internet and provides an easy to use interface for internet access.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Hancock, regarding utilizing the internet as the network to convey shipping information, to include the step of where the browser program is Netscape Navigator™, because it would provide an easy-to-use way to access the internet.

Regarding **Claim 7**, Hancock teaches all the limitations above except for **generating delivery-related information** (see column 9 line 22-24, delivery confirmation is generated upon delivery).

Regarding **Claim 10**, Hancock teaches all the limitations above except for **a shipment management platform** (see column 6 line 20-21, a variety of software platforms may be used to operate on the network, also see column 6 line 26-30, a variety of equipment platforms may be used).

Claims 8, 9, 11 and 12 recite similar limitations as those recited in **Claims 1-6** above, and are therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 5922040 by Prabhakaran discloses a method and apparatus for fleet management.

US 6,151,588 by Tozzoli discloses a full service trade system.

US 2002/0107772 by Jain discloses a method and device utilizing a polymorphic data in ecommerce. This is used in the context of full service trading, including for export.

US 2002/0095355 by Walker discloses a computer-implemented international trade system.

US 2002/0073170 by Hoffman discloses a method and apparatus for mobile wireless communication in the logistics industry.

US 2002/0069096 by Lindoerfer discloses a method and system for supplier relationship management.

US 2002/0049622 by Lettich discloses a method for providing shipping and logistics services.

Business Wire, "Pfastship Logistics International Presents Automation Shipping Software for the Millennium", June 23, 1998, p6230192, Dialog 5651854 50107597.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan G. Sterrett whose telephone number is 571-272-6881. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JGS 11-14-2005

TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600